

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY
INTERVIEW ON ZDF TELEVISION
MUNICH, GERMANY
FEBRUARY 5, 1994

Q. Your second day in office as the Secretary. Are you enjoying your visit to the Munich Conference?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Does this mean a special relationship with Germany in the future?

A. I believe we already have a special relationship with Germany. The U.S. Government and the U.S. Defense Department, in particular, is very anxious to maintain and build on that relationship. One of the first meetings I had when I came here today was with your Minister of Defense and with your Chancellor. All of those meetings, I feel, are very important with respect to maintaining and building on that special relationship.

Q. The Senate passed a resolution at the beginning of last week claiming (sic) Germany to do more in peacekeeping, peace making and peace enforcing. What's the position of the government of the United States to this?

A. The resolution you're referring to is a resolution passed in the United States Senate calling on Germany for increased participation in peacekeeping operations. I would point out to you that that was a Senate resolution. The United States government will not take a position on that question. We do not feel that it is our position to instruct the German government on how to make major decisions regarding these operations.

Q. As I understood the speech President Clinton made last year in front of the United Nations, the United States itself is also very careful in engaging in something the United Nations might do in the future. Is it a correct answer then, for the Germans also to be a little bit careful about engaging in conflicts anywhere in the world?

A. We will be, and I think every nation in the United Nations should be, very careful in the commitment of military forces to other countries as a part of peacekeeping operations. Nevertheless, we should not shirk from doing that when there is a clear humanitarian benefit to these forces being supplied. We are concerned; we remain concerned about the relative lack of facility in the United Nations for providing the command and control and the organization of military forces of many nations. That is, there is an absence of a capability there. And so, as we get involved, we believe that in time the United Nations will develop this capability so that multi-national peacekeeping operations can go more smoothly. In the meantime, we would like to limit our involvement in multi-national peacekeeping operations to those where a clear and effective command and control system has been established. NATO, for example, a NATO operation has very effective and important infrastructure in command and control. We formed on a coalition basis the same kind of an effective command and control infrastructure during the Desert Storm Operation in the war with Iraq although we drew heavily on NATO equipment and NATO experience in that operation.

Q. Do you expect in the future a new, another burden sharing debate in so far as is concerned with UN activities between Europe and the United States?

A. My experience is that burden sharing is always a debate, every year and it will continue to be. In order for multi-national military operations to be successful, the infrastructure must be prepared, it must be bought and provided and that is what burden sharing all about. It provides an equitable way of dividing the costs for the infrastructure which is used by all nations.

Q. And is Germany, in your eyes, sufficiently equipped for this?

A. I believe that Germany has been one of the leaders in providing their share of the infrastructure. Look at NATO, for example.

Q. Thank You.

A. Thank You.